Pathways Provider Performance Reports:
Good but not entirely "da bomb"

August 2007

Why did we do it and what is its impact

- Why
  - Accountability
    - Provider
    - LME
  - Informed Consumer Choice
  - Transparency of the system
- Impact
  - Some acceptance, some fear among providers
  - Change in provider challenges to decisions
  - Improvement in public information and transparency
  - Accountability of LME staff

The Development Process

- More than 4 years in the making
- More than 10 drafts including an interim step of Provider Directory
- Initial discussion internal to LME
- 3 years of discussion with CFAC
  - Subgroup of CFAC
- 6 months of discussion with Provider Association
- Several community presentations of drafts
- Current product went live Fall of 2006

Suggestions around the Process

- Constant involvement of CFAC—at least subgroup—Do this first
- Involvement of providers—at least a subgroup
- Input of Community Partners
- Use information/data that you already have
- Start simple

Guiding Principles

- Helpful to consumers
  - Brief but thorough
  - Captures consistent key points
    - Location
    - Pay source accepted
    - Performance against standards (not necessarily knowing what the standards are)
- Fair to Providers
  - As objective as possible
  - Balance between good and bad
  - Consideration of type of service and type of consumer
- Uses everyday language
- Electronic and minimizing duplication of LME efforts
- Verifiable
  - Withstands challenges/litigation
  - Has supporting documentation

Current Product

- See Sample in handouts for an example
- The Sections:
  - Provider Demographic information
  - Overall agency compliance with rules
  - Contract/MOA compliance
  - (Mystery Shopper—Not yet active)
  - Special information—opportunity to brag
  - Areas of Concern—Plans of Correction over past 24 months
  - Information about services and locations—gets to more (too much?) detail. This is endorsement info.

Perception of Current Product

- Consumers
  - Like it, but not sure all language makes sense
  - May be too much, really want a score and drill down options
  - Some want more, some want less
- Providers
  - Like it in general because perception is that we are not making stuff up
  - Good providers like it more
  - More challenges to having a Plan of Correction
- Community
  - Like it, but there is limited use of it
- LME staff
  - Hard to keep data current, one extra step is entering information into system
  - Clearly increase accountability to be precise

Data of Current Product "Hits"

- Monthly Averages February 2007-July 2007
  - Page loads = 639
  - Unique Visitors = 403
  - New Visitors = 244
  - Returning Visitors = 159

  It gets a lot of traffic

Pitfalls and lessons learned

- Too much info…too little info
- Hard to stay current
- Websites do crash
- Not in hardcopy
- Special information is not submitted very often
- Not easy to find on website
- Not very common language
- Mystery Shopper is hard to get—very complicated in terms of what, how, who and when
- Performance Data (NC TOPPS, Incidents etc) hard to calculate and present in an understandable way

Next Steps

- Continue to include non-endorsable (IPRS) services

- Add Mystery Shopper data

- Add NC TOPPS submission data

- Make a simpler cover sheet that gives a score (ABC, Star system, or Green/Yellow/Red) that combines the listed data, and then user can click for details